

Feshbach projection formalism for quantum non-Markovian dynamics

Dariusz Chruściński and Andrzej Kossakowski
Institute of Physics
Faculty of Physics, Astronomy and Informatics,
Nicolaus Copernicus University
Grudziadzka 5, 87-100 Toruń, Poland

We provide a new approach to open quantum systems which is based on the Feshbach projection method in an appropriate Hilbert space. Instead of looking for a master equation for the dynamical map acting in the space of density operators we provide the corresponding equation for the evolution in the Hilbert space of the system. Its solution enables one to construct a legitimate quantum evolution (completely positive and trace preserving). The big advantage of this approach is the ability of performing a consistent approximation which creates notorious problems in the standard Nakajima-Zwanzig approach. The new scheme is illustrated by well known spin-boson model beyond rotating wave approximation.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Yz, 03.65.Ta, 42.50.Lc

Introduction. – The description of a quantum system interacting with its environment is of fundamental importance for quantum physics and defines the central objective of the theory of open quantum systems [1, 2]. During the last few years there has been an increasing interest in open quantum systems in connection to the growing interest in controlling quantum systems and applications in modern quantum technologies such as quantum communication, cryptography, computation and ever growing number of applications. In practice, this theory is usually applied in the so-called Markovian or memoryless approximation. However, when strong coupling or long environmental relaxation times make memory effects important for a realistic description of the dynamics one needs more refine approach and hence the general structure of non-Markovian quantum evolution is a crucial issue. For the recent papers devoted to both theoretical and experimental aspects of quantum evolution with memory see e.g. a collection of papers in [4] and references therein.

The standard approach to the dynamics of open system uses the Nakajima-Zwanzig projection operator technique [5] which shows that under fairly general conditions, the master equation for the reduced density matrix $\rho(t)$ takes the form of the following non-local equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho_t = \int_0^t \mathcal{K}_{t-u}\rho_u du, \quad (1)$$

in which quantum memory effects are taken into account through the introduction of the memory kernel $\mathcal{K}_t$: this simply means that the rate of change of the state ρ_t at time t depends on its history. An alternative and technically much simpler scheme is the time-convolutionless projection operator technique [1, 6, 7] in which one obtains a first-order differential equation for the reduced density matrix

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho_t = L_t\rho_t. \quad (2)$$

The advantage of the local approach consists in the fact that it yields an equation of motion for the relevant degrees of freedom which is local in time and which is therefore often much easier to deal with than the Nakajima-Zwanzig non-local master equation (1).

It should be stressed that the structure of the memory kernel $\mathcal{K}_t$ is highly nontrivial and, therefore, the non-local master equation (1) is rather untractable. Note, that this equation is exact, i.e. in deriving (1) one does not use any specific approximation. Approximating (1) is a delicate issue. One often applies second order Born approximation which considerably simplifies the structure of $\mathcal{K}_t$. However, this approximation in general violates basic properties of the master equation like for example complete positivity or even positivity of ρ_t [8]. Further simplification of (1) consists in various Markov approximations which allow one to avoid memory effects. These approximations may also break the physics of the problem. For example well known local Redfield equation [9] again violates complete positivity [1, 8]. The problem of a consistent Markov approximation was studied by Dümcke and Spohn [11]. One often tries to use phenomenological memory kernels. However, as was already observed by Barnett and Stenholm [12], there is no simple recipe how to construct $\mathcal{K}_t$ in order to preserve basic properties of quantum evolution [13, 14].

The local approach based on (2) is much more popular. Clearly, the mathematical structure of (2) is much more “friendly” than that of (1). Moreover, the local equation provides a straightforward generalization of the celebrated Markovian semigroup governed by the time-independent generator L possessing well known standard form [15, 16]

$$L\rho = -i[H, \rho] + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha} ([V_{\alpha}\rho, V_{\alpha}^{\dagger}] + [V_{\alpha}, \rho V_{\alpha}^{\dagger}]), \quad (3)$$

with the effective Hamiltonian H and arbitrary noise operators V_{α} . Note, however, that local equation (2), contrary to generalized master equation (1), is not derived

from any specific microscopic model. Therefore, it is a rather phenomenological equation which generalizes (3) for time-dependent situation. Again, there is no general recipe how to construct legitimate local generators. It should be also stressed that Markovian semigroup, being a special case of (2), is derived from (1) by applying quite sophisticated Markovian approximations like for example weak coupling or singular coupling limits [10, 11].

Recently, there are several proposals to define and describe non-Markovian evolution [17–20]. Rivas et. al. [18] define non-Markovianity of the evolution by deviation from divisibility. A different approach is advocated by Breuer et al [19]. It defines non-Markovian dynamics as a time evolution for the open system characterized by a temporary flow of information from the environment back into the system and manifests itself as an increase in the distinguishability of pairs of evolving quantum states. According to this definition the evolution is Markovian if $\frac{d}{dt} \|\rho_t - \sigma_t\|_1 \leq 0$ for all initial states ρ and σ and $t \geq 0$. Optimizing over ρ, σ enables to construct suitable non-Markovianity measure [19] (for comparing these two notions of non-Markovianity see e.g. [21–23]). Other measures of non-Markovianity were recently proposed as well [24–28].

A different approach to reduced dynamics of open systems is based on the solution of the Schrödinger equation for the original composed system: one solves $\frac{d}{dt} |\Psi_t\rangle = -iH|\Psi_t\rangle$ and then defines reduced dynamics $\rho_t = \text{tr}_E |\Psi_t\rangle\langle\Psi_t|$ by tracing out environmental degrees of freedom. It is clear that such solution gives us only a single trajectory in the space of density operators. Note, however, that if we start with $|\Psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle \otimes |\psi_E\rangle$ as an initial state, then linearity of evolution enables us to construct a legitimate dynamical map $\Lambda_t(\rho_0)$ for any initial mixed state ρ_0 of the system. In this case one easily finds that formally $\rho_t = \Lambda_t(\rho_0)$ satisfies the local equation (2) with time dependent generator defined by $L_t := \dot{\Lambda}_t \Lambda_t^{-1}$. By construction this generator is physically legitimate giving rise to complete positive and trace preserving dynamical map Λ_t . Note, however, that this construction is slightly artificial since knowing Λ_t the problem of reduced dynamics is completely solved even if the corresponding equation for Λ_t is not known. The prominent example of this approach is well known spin-boson model [1].

Gauge theory of quantum systems. – In this Letter we provide a new approach to the reduced dynamics of open quantum systems. Instead of applying the Nakajima-Zwanzig projection we apply the Feshbach projection formalism [29] to the Schrödinger equation of the total system. This formalism was recently applied in the context of open quantum system in [30–32]. Our approach, however, is based not on the Schrödinger equation for the vector state $|\Psi_t\rangle$ but on the Schrödinger-like equation for the “amplitude” operator. Let us recall that if ρ is density operator in $\mathcal{H}$ then a Hilbert-Schmidt operator $\kappa \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{H})$ is called an amplitude of ρ if $\rho = \kappa\kappa^\dagger$. Recall, that $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{H})$ is equipped with a scalar product $(\kappa, \eta) = \text{tr}(\kappa^\dagger \eta)$ and $\kappa \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{H})$ if the Hilbert-Schmidt

norm $\|\kappa\|^2 = (\kappa, \kappa)$ is finite. Note that $\text{tr} \rho = 1$ implies $(\kappa, \kappa) = 1$. If $a^\dagger = a$ is an observable, then

$$(\kappa, a\kappa) = \text{tr}(\kappa^\dagger a\kappa) = \text{tr}(a\kappa\kappa^\dagger) = \text{tr}(a\rho), \quad (4)$$

reproduces the standard formula for the expectation value of a in the state ρ . Amplitudes display a natural gauge symmetry: a gauge transformation $\kappa \rightarrow \kappa U$ leaves $\rho = \kappa\kappa^\dagger$ invariant for any unitary operator U in $\mathcal{H}$. The main idea of this paper is to analyze the dynamics of gauge invariant ρ in terms of its gauge dependent amplitudes κ . This is well known trick in physics. Recall that for example in Maxwell theory it is much easier to analyze Maxwell equations not in terms of gauge invariant $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ fields but in terms of gauge dependent four potential A_μ . Suppose that ρ_t satisfies von-Neumann equation

$$i\partial_t \rho_t = [H_t, \rho_t], \quad (5)$$

with time-dependent Hamiltonian H_t . Its solution is given by $\rho_t = V_t \rho V_t^\dagger$, where the unitary operator V_t solves the Schrödinger equation $i\partial_t V_t = H_t V_t$ with the initial condition $V_0 = \mathbb{I}$. The corresponding amplitude κ_t satisfies

$$i\partial_t \kappa_t = H_t \kappa_t - \kappa_t G_t, \quad (6)$$

where G_t is an arbitrary time-dependent Hermitian operator. One finds $\kappa_t = V_t \kappa W_t^\dagger$, where the unitary operator W_t solves the Schrödinger equation $i\partial_t W_t = G_t W_t$. Hence $\kappa_t \kappa_t^\dagger = V_t \kappa \kappa^\dagger V_t^\dagger$. If $G_t = H_t$ then κ_t satisfies the same von-Neumann equation as ρ_t (such choice is used e.g. in [33]). Let us observe that if κ_t solves (6) then a local (i.e. time-dependent) gauge transformation

$$\kappa'_t = \kappa_t U_t, \quad (7)$$

does not effect $\rho_t = \kappa'_t \kappa'^{\dagger}_t$. Note, that κ'_t solves the following equation

$$i\partial_t \kappa'_t = H_t \kappa'_t - \kappa'_t G'_t, \quad (8)$$

where

$$G'_t = U_t^\dagger G_t U_t - iU_t^\dagger \partial_t U_t, \quad (9)$$

and hence G_t transforms like a non-abelian gauge field. It is, therefore, clear that taking U_t such that $i\partial_t U_t = G_t U_t$ one kills G -term and arrives at the Schrödinger-like equation for an amplitude

$$i\partial_t \kappa_t = H_t \kappa_t. \quad (10)$$

As we shall see this simple choice leads to considerable simplification of the underlying structure of the gauge theory. Note that the Schrödinger-like equation (10) still allows for global (i.e. time independent) gauge transformations $\kappa_t \rightarrow \kappa_t U$.

Feshbach projection technique. – Consider a quantum system coupled to the environment living in $\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_E$

and let H denote the total Hamiltonian of the composed system. Moreover, let $\rho \otimes \Omega$ be an initial state of the composed system and denote by $\kappa_S \otimes \kappa_E$ an amplitude of the initial state, i.e. $\rho = \kappa_S \kappa_S^\dagger$ and $\Omega = \kappa_E \kappa_E^\dagger$. We introduce orthogonal projectors $P_\alpha : \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_E) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_E)$

$$P_0 \mu_S \otimes \mu_E = \mu_S \otimes \kappa_E (\kappa_E, \mu_E), \quad P_1 = \mathbb{I} - P_0. \quad (11)$$

Let $\kappa_t \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_E)$ satisfy Schrödinger-like equation

$$i\partial_t \kappa_t = H \kappa_t, \quad \kappa_0 = \kappa_S \otimes \kappa_E, \quad (12)$$

and $(\kappa_S, \kappa_S) = (\kappa_E, \kappa_E) = 1$. Standard Feshbach projection technique [29] leads to

$$\partial_t P_0 \kappa_t = -iH_{00} P_0 \kappa_t - iH_{01} P_1 \kappa_t, \quad (13)$$

$$\partial_t P_1 \kappa_t = -iH_{10} P_0 \kappa_t - iH_{11} P_1 \kappa_t, \quad (14)$$

where we introduced a convenient notation $H_{ij} = P_i H P_j$. Solving for the irrelevant part $P_1 \kappa_t$

$$P_1 \kappa_t = -i \int_0^t ds e^{-i(t-s)H_{11}} H_{10} P_0 \kappa_s,$$

one ends up with the following non-local equation for the relevant (system) part $P_0 \kappa_t$:

$$\partial_t P_0 \kappa_t = -iH_{00} P_0 \kappa_t - \int_0^t \mathbb{K}_{t-s} P_0 \kappa_s ds, \quad (15)$$

with $\mathbb{K}_t = H_{01} e^{-itH_{11}} H_{10}$. Let $Z_t : \mathcal{H}_S \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_S$ be defined by

$$(Z_t \kappa_S) \otimes \kappa_E = P_0 \kappa_t = P_0 U_t (\kappa_S \otimes \kappa_E), \quad (16)$$

where $U_t = e^{-iHt}$. Equation (15) may be rewritten as the following equation for Z_t

$$\partial_t Z_t = -iH_{\text{eff}} Z_t - \int_0^t M_{t-s} Z_s ds, \quad (17)$$

where the effective system Hamiltonian is defined by $H_{\text{eff}} = \text{tr}_E(H \cdot \mathbb{I} \otimes \Omega)$ and $M_t = \text{tr}_E(\mathbb{K}_t \cdot \mathbb{I} \otimes \Omega)$. The above equation may be formally solved in terms of the Laplace transform $\hat{Z}_p$ as follows $\hat{Z}_p = (p\mathbb{I} + iH_{\text{eff}} + \hat{M}_p)^{-1}$. Let us observe that $(Z_t \kappa_S, Z_t \kappa_S) \leq (\kappa_S, \kappa_S)$ which shows that $Z_t \kappa_S$ is no longer a legitimate amplitude for $t > 0$. It is clear since Z_t describes the decay of κ_S and hence $\|Z_t \kappa_S\|$ is not conserved – it leaks out to the irrelevant part $P_1 U_t (\kappa_S \otimes \kappa_E)$. There is, however, a natural way to construct a legitimate dynamical map Λ_t such that $\Lambda_t(\kappa_S \kappa_S^\dagger)$ is a well defined state. Let a be a system operator and define the dynamical map Λ_t as follows

$$\begin{aligned} (\Lambda_t(\kappa_S \kappa_S^\dagger), a) &= (\kappa_t, (a \otimes \mathbb{I}_E) \kappa_t) \\ &= (P_0 \kappa_t, (a \otimes \mathbb{I}_E) P_0 \kappa_t) + (P_1 \kappa_t, (a \otimes \mathbb{I}_E) P_1 \kappa_t), \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

for all $t \geq 0$ and $\kappa_0 = \kappa_S \otimes \kappa_E$. Simple calculation shows that

$$\Lambda_t(\rho) = Z_t \rho Z_t^\dagger + \text{Tr}_E(Y_t[\rho \otimes \Omega]Y_t^\dagger), \quad (19)$$

where the operator Y_t is defined by

$$Y_t = \int_0^t ds e^{-i(t-s)H_{11}} H_{10} (Z_s \otimes \mathbb{I}_E). \quad (20)$$

Recalling, that $\Lambda_t(\rho) = \text{Tr}_E(U_t[\rho \otimes \Omega]U_t^\dagger)$ with $U_t = e^{-itH}$ one has the following relation

$$\text{Tr}_E(U_t[\rho \otimes \Omega]U_t^\dagger) = Z_t \rho Z_t^\dagger + \text{Tr}_E(Y_t[\rho \otimes \Omega]Y_t^\dagger). \quad (21)$$

The pair of equations (17) and (19) defines the main result of this Letter. Note, that we have a solution for the dynamical map Λ_t but the equation of motion (17) is not for the map itself but for the operator Z_t . It should be clear that the formalism developed so far is hardly applicable in practice due to the complicated nature of the unitary operator $\exp(-iH_{11}t)$.

Interaction picture and Born-like approximation. – In searching for the reduced dynamics of an open system the standard procedure is to pass to the interaction picture to remove the free evolution of the system itself [1]. Consider the Hamiltonian of the total composed system in the standard form

$$H = H_0 + V = H_S \otimes \mathbb{I}_E + \mathbb{I} \otimes H_E + V. \quad (22)$$

Defining $V(t) = e^{iH_0 t} V e^{-iH_0 t}$ one finds the following formula for the evolution in the interaction picture

$$\tilde{\Lambda}_t(\rho) = \tilde{Z}_t \rho \tilde{Z}_t^\dagger + \text{Tr}_E(\tilde{Y}_t[\rho \otimes \Omega]\tilde{Y}_t^\dagger), \quad (23)$$

where $\tilde{Y}_t$ is defined by

$$\tilde{Y}_t = \int_0^t ds W_{t,s} V_{10}(s) (\tilde{Z}_s \otimes \mathbb{I}_E), \quad (24)$$

with unitary

$$W_{t,s} = \text{T exp} \left(-i \int_s^t V_{11}(u) du \right), \quad (25)$$

and T denotes chronological product. Finally, system operators $\tilde{Z}_t$ satisfies the following non-local equation

$$\partial_t \tilde{Z}_t = -iV_{\text{eff}}(t) \tilde{Z}_t - \int_0^t \tilde{M}_{t,s} \tilde{Z}_s ds, \quad (26)$$

where $V_{\text{eff}}(t) = \text{tr}_E(V(t) \cdot \mathbb{I} \otimes \Omega)$ and $\tilde{M}_{t,s} = \text{tr}_E(\mathbb{K}_{t,s} \cdot \mathbb{I} \otimes \Omega)$ with $\mathbb{K}_{t,s} = V_{01}(t) W_{t,s} V_{10}(s)$. Note that operators Y_t , M_t and interaction picture counterparts $\tilde{Y}_t$ and $\tilde{M}_{t,s}$ contain an infinite number of multi-time correlations functions which makes the full problem rather untractable. The advantage of our approach is that it allows to a series of consistent approximations. By a consistent we mean an approximation which results in completely positive and trace preserving evolution of a density matrix, that is, legitimate dynamical map Λ_t . This is a notorious problem in the standard Nakajima-Zwanzig approach. The simplest approximation consists in neglecting $V_{11}(t)$. Roughly speaking $V_{11}(t)$ is responsible

for transitions within irrelevant part of the Hilbert space $P_1(\mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_E)$. It means that one approximates the evolution operator $W_{t,s} = T \exp(-i \int_0^t V_{11}(\tau) d\tau)$ by $\mathbb{I}_S \otimes \mathbb{I}_E$. It leads to the second order approximation for the memory kernel $\tilde{M}_{t,s} = \text{Tr}_E[\mathbb{I} \otimes \Omega V_{01}(t) V_{10}(s)]$ and hence it is natural to call it Born-like approximation. The big advantage of our approach consists in the fact that the above approximation leads to the legitimate completely positive and trace preserving quantum evolution.

Example: spin-boson model. – To illustrate our approach let us consider well known spin-boson model [1] beyond rotating wave approximation (RWA) defined by

$$H_S = \omega_0 \sigma^+ \sigma^- , \quad H_E = \int dk \omega(k) a^\dagger(k) a(k) , \quad (27)$$

and the interaction term

$$V = \sigma^+ \otimes [a(f) + a^\dagger(h)] + \sigma^- \otimes [a^\dagger(f) + a(h)] , \quad (28)$$

where $a^\dagger(f) = \int dk f(k) a^\dagger(k)$. As usual $\sigma^\pm$ are standard raising and lowering qubit operators. Note that a form-factor ‘ h ’ introduces counter-rotating terms. One easily computes

$$V(t) = e^{-i\omega_0 t} \sigma^+ \otimes [a(f_t) + a^\dagger(h_t)] + \text{h.c.} , \quad (29)$$

where time-dependent form-factors read $f_t(k) = e^{-i\omega(k)t} f(k)$ and a similar formula for h_t . Let Ω_β be a thermal equilibrium state of the environment at the inverse temperature β , that is, $\Omega_\beta = e^{-\beta H_E} / \text{Tr}(e^{-\beta H_E})$. In the standard approach one takes zero temperature state $\Omega_\infty = |\text{vac}\rangle\langle\text{vac}|$, with $|\text{vac}\rangle$ being the vacuum state of the field [1]. Introducing n -point correlation functions $\langle A_1 A_2 \dots A_n \rangle_\beta = \text{Tr}(A_1 A_2 \dots A_n \Omega_\beta)$ one has $\langle a(f) \rangle_\beta = \langle a^\dagger(f) \rangle_\beta = 0$ and

$$\langle a(f) a(h) \rangle_\beta = \langle a^\dagger(f) a^\dagger(h) \rangle_\beta = 0 ,$$

and hence $\langle V(t) \rangle_\beta = 0$. Let κ_E be an amplitude of Ω_β , that is, $\kappa_E = \Omega_\beta^{1/2} U$ with arbitrary unitary U in $\mathcal{H}_E$. In the Born-like approximation the formula $\tilde{M}_{t,s}$ reduces to

$$\tilde{M}_{t,s} = m_1(t, s) |1\rangle\langle 1| + m_2(t, s) |2\rangle\langle 2| , \quad (30)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} m_1(t, s) &= e^{-i\omega_0(t-s)} [\langle a(f_t) a^\dagger(f_s) \rangle_\beta + \langle a^\dagger(h_t) a(h_s) \rangle_\beta] , \\ m_2(t, s) &= e^{i\omega_0(t-s)} [\langle a(h_t) a^\dagger(h_s) \rangle_\beta + \langle a^\dagger(f_t) a(f_s) \rangle_\beta] . \end{aligned}$$

It proves that within this approximation the dynamics of Z_t is fully controlled by 2-point correlation functions $\langle a(f_t) a^\dagger(f_s) \rangle_\beta$ and $\langle a^\dagger(f_t) a(f_s) \rangle_\beta$ and similarly with f_t replaced by h_t . The above 2-point correlation functions are time homogeneous due to the invariance of Ω_β and hence $m_k(t, s) = m_k(t - s)$. It is, therefore, clear that the solution of (26) has the following form

$$\tilde{Z}_t = z_1(t) |1\rangle\langle 1| + z_2(t) |2\rangle\langle 2| , \quad (31)$$

where the complex functions $z_k(t)$ satisfy

$$\partial_t z_k(t) = - \int_0^t m_k(t-s) z_k(s) ds , \quad (32)$$

with $\tilde{z}_k(0) = 1$. Interestingly, we have to decouple equations for z_k . Having solved for $\tilde{Z}_t$ one computes $\text{Tr}_E(\tilde{Y}_t[\rho \otimes \Omega_\beta] \tilde{Y}_t^\dagger)$, where $\tilde{Y}_t = \int_0^t ds V_{10}(s) \tilde{Z}_s \otimes \mathbb{I}_E$. Observing that $V_{10}(s) = P_1 V(s) P_0 = V(s) P_0$ due to $P_0 V(t) P_0 = 0$, one finds the following Kraus representation for the map $\rho \rightarrow \text{Tr}_E(\tilde{Y}_t[\rho \otimes \Omega_\beta] \tilde{Y}_t^\dagger)$:

$$d_1(t) \sigma^+ \rho \sigma^- + d_2(t) \sigma^- \rho \sigma^+ + \alpha(t) \sigma^+ \rho \sigma^+ + \alpha^*(t) \sigma^- \rho \sigma^- ,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} d_1(t) &= \int_0^t ds \int_0^t du e^{-i\omega_0(s-u)} D_1(s-u) z_1(s) z_1^*(u) , \\ d_2(t) &= \int_0^t ds \int_0^t du e^{i\omega_0(s-u)} D_2(s-u) z_2(s) z_2^*(u) , \\ \alpha(t) &= \int_0^t ds \int_0^t du e^{-i\omega_0(s+u)} A(s-u) z_1(s) z_2^*(u) . \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} D_1(s-u) &= \langle a(f_s) a^\dagger(f_u) \rangle_\beta + \langle a^\dagger(h_s) a(h_u) \rangle_\beta , \\ D_2(s-u) &= \langle a^\dagger(f_s) a(f_u) \rangle_\beta + \langle a(h_s) a^\dagger(h_u) \rangle_\beta , \\ A(s-u) &= \langle a(f_s) a^\dagger(h_u) \rangle_\beta + \langle a^\dagger(h_s) a(f_u) \rangle_\beta . \end{aligned}$$

Interestingly, the preservation of trace implies that

$$d_k(t) + |z_k(t)|^2 = 1 ,$$

for $k = 1, 2$. Actually, this simple condition is hardly visible from the definition of $d_k(t)$ and the corresponding non-local equations for $z_k(t)$. The standard spin-boson model [1] is easily recovered if $\beta \rightarrow \infty$, $|z_1(t)| = 1$ and $\alpha(t) = 0$. In this case the vacuum correlation functions simplify to $D_1(s-u) = \langle a(h_u) a^\dagger(h_s) \rangle_{\text{vac}}$, $D_2(s-u) = \langle a(f_u) a^\dagger(f_s) \rangle_{\text{vac}}$, and $A(s-u) = \langle a(f_u) a^\dagger(h_s) \rangle_{\text{vac}}$ due to $\langle a^\dagger(f_t) a(f_s) \rangle_{\text{vac}} = \langle a^\dagger(h_t) a(h_s) \rangle_{\text{vac}} = 0$. Now, in the white noise limit

$$\begin{aligned} \langle a(h_s) a^\dagger(h_u) \rangle_{\text{vac}} &= \gamma_1 \delta(s-u) , \\ \langle a(f_s) a^\dagger(f_u) \rangle_{\text{vac}} &= \gamma_2 \delta(s-u) , \\ \langle a(f_s) a^\dagger(h_u) \rangle_{\text{vac}} &= \eta \delta(s-u) , \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

with $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \geq 0$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\gamma_1 \gamma_2 \geq |\eta|^2$, one obtains the following formula for the dynamical map

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{11}(t) &= e^{-\gamma_1 t} \rho_{11} + (1 - e^{-\gamma_2 t}) \rho_{22} , \\ \rho_{22}(t) &= e^{-\gamma_2 t} \rho_{22} + (1 - e^{-\gamma_1 t}) \rho_{11} , \\ \rho_{12}(t) &= e^{-\frac{1}{2}[\gamma_1 + \gamma_2]t} \rho_{12} + \eta(t) \rho_{21} , \\ \rho_{21}(t) &= e^{-\frac{1}{2}[\gamma_1 + \gamma_2]t} \rho_{21} + \eta^*(t) \rho_{12} , \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where $\eta(t) = \frac{2\eta}{\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + 4i\omega_0} (1 - e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + 4i\omega_0)t})$. It is easy to show that in the standard secular approximation $\eta(t) \equiv 0$. Note, however, that even in the secular

approximation the above dynamics does not correspond to a semigroup unless γ_1 or γ_2 vanish, that is, the interaction Hamiltonian contains either resonant or anti-resonant terms only. Interestingly, if both γ s are strictly positive then asymptotically one has

$$\rho_{11}(t) \rightarrow \rho_{22}, \quad \rho_{22}(t) \rightarrow \rho_{11}, \quad (35)$$

which means that asymptotically the occupations of levels ρ_{11} and ρ_{22} simply swap. Hence, such evolution does not have a proper equilibrium state and displays highly non-ergodic behavior (its asymptotic state highly depend upon the initial one).

Conclusions. – We have provided a new approach to open systems quantum dynamics. Contrary to the standard Nakajima-Zwanzig projection technique in the Banach space of density operators it is based on the Feshbach projection technique in the Hilbert space of amplitudes. The main advantages of presented approach are *i*) it is based on a much simpler dynamical equation not for the dynamical map itself but for the linear operator acting in the system Hilbert space. Solving this equation one constructs the exact dynamical map. *ii*) This approach, contrary to used so far Hilbert space techniques, enables one to work with mixed states of the environment. *iii*) Its crucial property is the ability for coherent approximations. This is a notorious problem with

Nakajima-Zwanzig equation.

We have illustrated a simple Born-like approximation within the standard spin-boson model beyond RWA. Moreover, contrary to the standard approach [1] we do not assume that an environment is in the vacuum state and consider the general invariant equilibrium state Ω_β . Let us observe that this approach enables one to perform more refine approximations. The general idea consists in “reducing” an irrelevant part, that is, the range of P_1 . One may introduce an *approximate* projector P_1^{app} such that its range defines a proper subspace of the range of P_1 . For example in the spin-boson model if P_1^{app} projects into 1-particle sector then $P_1^{\text{app}}V(t)P_1^{\text{app}} \equiv 0$ and one recovers Born-like approximation. Interestingly, Born-like approximation does not result in a Markovian semigroup. Actually, even Markovian semigroup on the level of Z_t leads in general to genuine non-Markovian evolution on the level of a dynamical map Λ_t . It shows that Markovian evolution corresponds to much more refine approximation than simple Born-like one. It is hoped that further research reveals new aspects of quantum evolution and intricate relations between Markovian and non-Markovian dynamics.

This work was partially supported by the National Science Centre project DEC-2011/03/B/ST2/00136.

-
- [1] H.-P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, 2007).
 - [2] U. Weiss, *Quantum Dissipative Systems*, (World Scientific, Singapore, 2000).
 - [3] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2000).
 - [4] F. Benatti, R. Floreanini, and G. Scholes eds., *Special issue on loss of coherence and memory effects in quantum dynamics*, J. Phys. B **45**, No. 15 (2012).
 - [5] S. Nakajima, Prog. Theor. Phys. **20**, 948 (1958); R. Zwanzig, J. Chem. Phys. **33**, 1338 (1960).
 - [6] S. Chaturvedi and J. Shibata, Z. Phys. B **35**, 297 (1979); N. H. F. Shibata and Y. Takahashi, J. Stat. Phys. **17**, 171 (1977).
 - [7] H.-P. Breuer et al., Phys. Rev. A **59**, 1633 (1999).
 - [8] F. Benatti and R. Floreanini, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **19**, 3063 (2005).
 - [9] A.G. Redfield, IBM J. Res. Dev. **1**, 19 (1957); Adv. Magn. Reson. **1**, 1 (1965).
 - [10] R. Alicki and K. Lendi, *Quantum Dynamical Semigroups and Applications* (Springer, Berlin, 1987).
 - [11] R. Dümcke and H. Spohn, Z. Physik B **34**, 419 (1979); R. Dümcke, J. Math. Phys. **24**, 311 (1983); H. Spohn, Rev. Mod. Phys. **53**, 569 (1980).
 - [12] S.M. Barnett and S. Stenholm, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 033808 (2001).
 - [13] A. Shabani and D. A. Lidar, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 020101 (R) (2005).
 - [14] S. Maniscalco, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 024103 (2005).
 - [15] V. Gorini, A. Kossakowski, and E. C. G. Sudarshan, J. Math. Phys. **17**, 821 (1976).
 - [16] G. Lindblad, Comm. Math. Phys. **48**, 119 (1976).
 - [17] M. M. Wolf and J. I. Cirac, Comm. Math. Phys. **279**, 147 (2008); M. M. Wolf, J. Eisert, T. S. Cubitt and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 150402 (2008).
 - [18] Á. Rivas, S.F. Huelga, and M.B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 050403 (2010).
 - [19] H.-P. Breuer, E.-M. Laine, J. Piilo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 210401 (2009).
 - [20] D. Chruściński and A. Kossakowski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 070406 (2010); EPL, **97**, 20005 (2012).
 - [21] P. Haikka, J. D. Cresser, and S. Maniscalco, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 012112 (2011).
 - [22] B. Vacchini, A. Smirne, E.-M. Laine, J. Piilo, and H.-P. Breuer, New J. Phys. **13**, 093004 (2011).
 - [23] D. Chruściński, Kossakowski and Á. Rivas, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 052128 (2011).
 - [24] X.-M. Lu, X. Wang, and C. P. Sun, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 042103 (2010).
 - [25] A. K. Rajagopal, A. R. Usha Devi, and R. W. Rendell, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 042107 (2010).
 - [26] S. C. Hou, X. X. Yi, S. X. Yu, and C. H. Oh, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 062115 (2011); Phys. Rev. A **86**, 012101 (2012).
 - [27] S. Luo, S. Fu, and H. Song, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 044101 (2012).
 - [28] B. Bylicka, D. Chruściński, and S. Maniscalco, arXiv:1301.2585.
 - [29] H. Feshbach, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **5**, 357 (1958); **19**, 287 (1962).

- [30] P. Gaspard and M. Nagaoka, J. Chem. Phys. **111**, 5676 (1999).
- [31] L.-A. Wu, G. Kurizki, and P. Brumer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 080405 (2009).
- [32] J. Jing, L.-A. Wu, J. Q. You, and T. Yu, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 032123 (2012).
- [33] V. Bach, J. Fröhlich, and I. M. Sigal, J. Math. Phys. **41**, 3985 (2000).